

Gonda 1973 J. Gonda, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, 2nd. ed., Delhi, 1973 (ŚātaPiṭaka Series vol. 99).

Goudriaan and Hooykaas 1971 T. Goudriaan and C. Hooykaas, *Stuti and Stava (Bauddha, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava) of Balinese Brahmin Priests*, Amsterdam, 1971.

Hirakawa 1973 Akira Hirakawa, *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*, Tokyo, 1973.

Kats 1910 J. Kats, *Sang Hyang Kamahāyānikan*, 's-Gravenhage, 1910.

Monier-Williams 1899 Sir Monier Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899.

Mylius 1980 Klaus Mylius, *Wörterbuch Sanskrit-Deutsch*, Leipzig, 1980.

Rhys Davids 1925 T.W. Rhys Davids, The Pāli Text Society's *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Chipstead, 1925.

Sara and Thakar 1962 B.J. Sandhi Sara and J.P. Thakar, *Lexicographic Studies in 'Jaina Sanskrit'*, Baroda, 1962.

Sarkar 1971 Himansu Bhushan Sarkar, *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, vol. 1 (of 2), Calcutta, 1971.

Sircar 1966 D.C. Sirkar, *Indian Epigraphic Glossary*, Delhi, 1966.

Schmidt 1928 Richard Schmidt, *Nachträge zum Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, Leipzig, 1928.

Teeuw and Robson 1981 A. Teeuw and S. Robson, *Kuñjarakarṇa Dharmakathana*, The Hague, 1981 (Bibliotheca Indonesica 21).

Zoetmulder 1982 P.J. Zoetmulder, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*, 2 vols, Leiden, 1982.

## VIMUTTIMAGGA AND ABHAYAGIRI: THE FORM-AGGREGATE ACCORDING TO THE SAMSKRTĀSAMSKRTA-VINIŚCAYA

### A. Introduction

The *Vimuttimagga* is a comprehensive manual of the Theravādin school; lost in the original Pāli (or, less probably, Sanskrit),<sup>1</sup> it is preserved in a complete Chinese translation, made by a *bhikṣu* of Funan in the early 6th century.<sup>2</sup> This version has been translated into English in full under the title *The Path of Freedom*.<sup>3</sup>

While both Chinese and Pāli sources agree that the name of the author is Upatissa (Skt Upatiṣya),<sup>4</sup> there is some confusion about the Sanskrit form of the translator's name. In 1883 Bunyiu Nanjio gave the name Saṃghapāla, with the alternative Saṃghavarman.<sup>5</sup> In 1915 Sylvain Lévi rejected the form Saṃghapāla as erroneous, and suggested

<sup>1</sup> cf. Bechert 1992, pp. 95–96, and Skilling 1993A, p. 167. See, however, Louis Renou and Jean Filliozat (edd.), *L'Inde classique II* (Hanoi, 1953) § 2147: “à en juger par les noms ou termes transcrits, la version chinoise du *Chemin de la Libération* ne semble pas être faite sur un original de langue pāli; on n'y trouve aucun nom singhalais ... tout indique, pour cet original, une origine indienne et non singhalaise”. Sylvain Lévi (1915, p. 26) notes, with reference to the *Mahāmāyūrī*, that \*Saṃghabhara “paraît être un sanscritiste et un indianiste médiocre”.

<sup>2</sup> T 1648 (Vol. XXXII), KBC 968, *Chieh t'o tao lun*.

<sup>3</sup> See Bibliography: the English translation is hereafter referred to as *Path*.

<sup>4</sup> The name, prefaced by “arhat”, is transcribed at the head of the Chinese version; in the *Visuddhimagga* Commentary the author is described as *thera* (*Paramatthamaṇjuśā*, cited at *Path* xxxvi, *ekacce ti upatissatheraṃ sandhāyāha, tena hi vimuttimagine tathā vuttam*).

<sup>5</sup> Bunyiu Nanjio, *A Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Sacred Canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan*, [Oxford, 1883] San Francisco, 1975, § 1293 “Saṃghapāla”; Appendix II § 102, “Saṃghapāla or Saṃghavarman”.

Samghavarman or Samghabhara.<sup>1</sup> In 1923 J. Przyluski, after referring to both Nanjio and Lévi, described Samghapāla as “doubtful”, and suggested Samghabhara or Samghabhaṭa.<sup>2</sup> In 1927 Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, after referring to the above-mentioned sources, rejected both Samghapāla and Samghavarman, and accepted Samghabhara.<sup>3</sup> The *Hōbōgirin* gives “Samghabhara (?)”,<sup>4</sup> as well as “Samghavara (?)”, and “Samghavarman (?)”.<sup>5</sup> Lancaster and Bareau give Samghabhara without discussion.<sup>6</sup> The *Path* reverts to Samghapāla; since the translators do not discuss the name, and since the bibliography does not refer to any of the other works mentioned above, it is likely that they took the name from Nanjio’s *Catalogue*, which they refer to on pp. xxvii and xxxvi. This is unfortunate, since the form Samghapāla, rejected by all authorities since Nanjio, has thereby been perpetuated.<sup>7</sup> For the time being, I accept the form \*Samghabhara; I hope that the question will be re-examined by those competent in the field, in the light of resources now available.

There is also confusion about the date of translation. Bagchi, Przyluski, and *Hōbōgirin* agree that \*Samghabhara’s dates are 460–524. Nanjio (§ 1293) gives the date of translation of the *Vimuttimagga* as 505, but since at Appendix II § 102 he himself says that \*Samghabhara began his

<sup>1</sup> Lévi, *loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> J. Przyluski, *La légende de l’empereur Açoka (Açoka-avadāna) dans les textes indiens et chinois*, Paris, 1923, pp. xi–xii.

<sup>3</sup> Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, tome I, Paris, 1927, pp. 415–18.

<sup>4</sup> *Hōbōgirin*, *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais*, Paris-Tōkyō, 1978, § 1648.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p. 281a, under Sōgyabara.

<sup>6</sup> KBC § 968; Bareau 1955, p. 242.

<sup>7</sup> Samghapāla is given by George Cœdès, in *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Honolulu, 1968, note 92, p. 285 (see also p. 58), by W. Pachow, “The Voyage of Buddhist Missions to South-East Asia and the Far East”, in *Journal of the Greater India Society* XVII/1&2 (1958), p. 13, and no doubt elsewhere in secondary literature.

career as a translator in 506 — a date confirmed by Lévi, Przyluski, and *Hōbōgirin* — this must be an error. Both Bagchi and Lancaster give the date of translation as the 14th year of the T’ien Chien era of the Liang Dynasty, which Bagchi equates with 519, Lancaster with 515. *L’Inde classique* states that the translation was made between 506 and 524, “probablement en 515”; *Hōbōgirin* does not give a date. According to Dr. Josef Kolmaš, 515 is the correct date.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the Chinese translation, the *Vimuttimagga* is known from extensive quotations given by Daśabalaśrīmitra in his *Samskṛtāsamskṛtviniścaya*, a compendium of the tenets of several Buddhist schools, also lost in the original, but extant in Tibetan translation.<sup>2</sup> In this paper, I will give an extract from Chapter 13 of the Sav, a citation of the *Vimuttimagga* which corresponds to the opening of the 10th fascicle, 11th chapter, first section, of the *Path* (pp. 237–38), in the following format:

- romanised Tibetan text;
- English translation of the Tibetan;
- English translation of the Chinese from the *Path*.<sup>3</sup>

The object of study is a passage giving a list of the 26 types of derived form (*upādāya-rūpa*) that, along with the four basic elements

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Dr. Kolmaš for checking the date for me during a visit to the Oriental Institute, Prague. It is likely that Nanjio’s 505 is simply a misprint for 515. (cf. also e.g. KBC 1086, where the 15th year of T’ien Chien = 516.)

<sup>2</sup> ‘*Dus byas dañ ‘dus ma byas rnam par nes pa* = Sav. I have been able to consult only two editions: D and Q (see Bibliography); variants are given in parentheses without discussion. For an analysis of this work and a discussion of its authorship and date, see Skilling 1987.

<sup>3</sup> From the passages selected for this study, it can be seen that the translation of the *Path* is often unreliable. I am grateful to Dr. Prapod Assavavirulhakarn (Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok) for consulting the Chinese text; his clarifications are followed by the initials [PA].

(*mahābhūta*), constitute the aggregate of form, *rūpa-kkhandā*. The list is of considerable interest and importance because it throws light on the problem of the school affiliation of the *Vimuttimagga*. Because “school” in this context refers to divisions or traditions within the broader fold of the Theravāda, the tradition of the Pāli *Āṭhakathās*, *Tikās*, and Abhidhamma manuals will be specified as that of the Mahāvihāravāsins throughout.<sup>1</sup>

I have also given the opening of the chapter leading up to the above-mentioned list, in order to place the passage in context, and — since Daśabalaśrīmitra’s citations of the *Vimuttimagga* have not been studied to date — to demonstrate how closely they agree with the Chinese version. I will also translate a number of other passages from the same chapter of the Sav in the discussion that follows.

## B. Text and Translation

**B.0a)** (D 185a3; Q 98b6) *paññita chen po gnas brtan dge sloñ* (D om. *gnas brtan dge sloñ*) *stobs bcu dpal bses gñen gyis bsdus pa 'dus byas dañ 'dus ma byas rnam par ñes pa las* (Q *la*) *gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul lugs phuñ po skye mched khams rnam par ñes pa žes bya ba le'u bcu gsum pa'o*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the two main divisions of the Theravāda, see Bareau 1955, chapters XXIX and XXX. A third branch, the Jetavāṇiyas or Sāgalikas (Bareau, chapter XXXI) seems to have played a less significant role. For the Abhayagiri, see *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1, fasc. 1, [Colombo] 1961, pp. 21–25 (“Abhayagiri”), 25–28 (“Abhayagirivāsins”), 67, 77–78 (“Abhidharma Literature”), and Walpola Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, [1956] 1966, pp. 83–85, 92–99, etc.

<sup>2</sup> This is the colophon of the chapter of the Sav from which the citations are drawn.

**B.0b)** “An analysis of the aggregates, bases, and elements according to the system of the Sthavira school” (\**Sthavira-nikāya-naya-skandha-āyatana-dhātu-viniścaya*), Chapter 13 of the *Analysis of the Conditioned and the Unconditioned*, compiled by the great authority (*mahāpaññita*), the senior monk (*sthavira-bhikṣu*), Daśabalaśrīmitra.<sup>1</sup>

**B.1a)** (D 179a1; Q 90b3) *'phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i luñ las 'di ltar rnam par bżag ste/ de la las dañ po pa'i rnal 'byor pas rga si las grol bar 'dod pa dañ/ 'khor ba'i rgyu yañ dag par gcod pa don du gñer ba (Q bas) dañ/ ma rig pa'i mun pa rnam par sel ba'i don du gñer ba dañ/ 'phags pa'i šes rab thob pa don du gñer ba rnames kyis gnas lña la mkhas par bskyed par bya'o/ 'di lta ste/ phuñ po la mkhas pa dañ/ skye mched la mkhas pa dañ/ khams la mkhas pa dañ/ rten ciñ 'brel bar 'byuñ ba la mkhas pa dañ/ 'phags pa'i bden pa la mkhas pa'o//*

**B.1b)** The Āgama of the Ārya-Sthavira school (*nikāya*) sets forth the following:

Herein, the novice meditator (*ādikammika-yogin*) who wishes to be liberated from ageing and death (*jarā-maraṇa*), who strives to cut off the cause of cyclic existence (*samsāra-* or *bhava-hetu*), who strives to dispel the darkness of ignorance (*avijjā-andhakāra*), and who strives to realise

<sup>1</sup> For the title, which, in accordance with Tibetan (and Indian) tradition, is given at the end of the chapter, I have given Sanskrit equivalents for the Tibetan. Although the bulk of the Sav, dealing with Vaibhāṣika and Mahāyāna tenets, would have been composed in Sanskrit, we do not know the language of the *Vimuttimagga* and other Sthavira citations given by Daśabalaśrīmitra. In order to facilitate comparison with the Mahāvihāravāsin Theravādin tradition, which is preserved in Pāli, I have given Pāli equivalents in the translation of the citations, based on the Sanskrit equivalents of the Tibetan as given for example in the *Mahāyyutpatti* (Mvy). In most cases these equivalents are virtually certain; those which require some explanation are discussed in the notes. The Pāli terms given in the citations of the *Path* have been taken from the footnotes to that work as appropriate.

the wisdom of the noble (*ariya-paññā*), should develop proficiency (*kosalla*) with regard to five states (*thāna*): proficiency with regard to the aggregates (*khandha-kosalla*), proficiency with regard to the bases (*āyatana-kosalla*), proficiency with regard to the elements (*dhātu-kosalla*), proficiency with regard to conditioned arising (*paṭicca-samuppāda-kosalla*), and proficiency with regard to the truths of the noble (*ariya-sacca-kosalla*).

**B.1c)** (*Path* 237,1) Here, if the new yogin aspires after release from decay and death, and wishes to remove the cause of arising and passing away, wishes to dispel the darkness of ignorance, to cut the rope of craving and to acquire holy wisdom, he should develop the methods, namely, the aggregate-method [*khandha-kosalla*, PA],<sup>1</sup> sense-organ-method [*āyatana-kosalla*], element-method [*dhātu-kosalla*], conditioned-arising-method [*paṭicca-samuppāda-kosalla*], and truth-method [*sacca-kosalla*].

**B.2a)** (D 179a3; Q 90b6) *de la phuṇ po lña ni 'di lta ste/ gzugs kyi phuṇ po daṇ/ tshor ba'i phuṇ po daṇ/ 'du śes kyi phuṇ po daṇ/ 'du byed kyi phuṇ po daṇ/ rnam par śes pa'i phuṇ po'o//*

<sup>1</sup> The translators of the *Path* supply the term *upāya*; the characters employed are also used for *kauśalya* = *kosalla*, equivalent here to the Tibetan *mkhas pa* [PA]. While forms with *kusala* (MN III 62,4, *dhātu-kusala*, *āyatana*-°, *paṭiccasamuppāda*-°, *ṭhānāṭhāna*-°), *kuśala* (E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil [edd.], *The Divyāvadāna*, Delhi, 1987, 340,26, and Nalinaksha Dutt [ed.], *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 4, [Calcutta, 1950] Delhi, 1984, 42,18, *dhātu-kuśala*, *pratīyasamutpāda*-°, *sthānāsthāna*-°; *Divyāvadāna* 567,8, *skandha-kuśala*, *dhātu*-°, *āyatana*-°, *pratīyasamutpāda*-°), or *kauśalya* (Vidhushekhar Bhattacharya [ed.], *The Yogācārabhūmi of Ācārya Asaṅga*, Calcutta, 1957, 71,9, *dhātu-kauśalya*, *āyatana*-°, *pratīyasamutpāda*-°, etc.) are well-attested in this context, the use of *upāya* is not. I therefore take the nominal form *kosalla* (for which confer PTSD 230b), equivalent to the Tibetan *mkhas pa* (in the passage cited clearly a noun = Skt *kauśalya*), to be the correct form.

**B.2b)** Herein, there are five aggregates (*khandha*): the aggregate of form (*rūpa*), the aggregate of feeling (*vedanā*), the aggregate of notion (*saññā*), the aggregate of formations (*saṅkhāra*), and the aggregate of consciousness (*viññāṇa*).

**B.2c)** (*Path* 237,8) What is the aggregate-method ? The five aggregates are the aggregate of form, the aggregate of feeling, the aggregate of perception, the aggregate of formation, and the aggregate of consciousness.

**B.3a)** (D 179a4; Q 90b6) *de la gzugs kyi phuṇ po ni gñis te (Q om. te) 'di ltar/ 'byuṇ ba chen po daṇ/ 'byuṇ ba chen po las byuṇ ba'i gzugs so//*

**B.3b)** Herein, the aggregate of form is twofold: the basic elements (*mahābhūta*) and form derived from the basic elements (*mahābhūtānam upādāya rūpam*).

**B.3c)** (*Path* 237,10) What is the aggregate of form ? The four primaries and the material qualities derived from the primaries.

**B.4a)** (D 179a4; Q 90b7) *de la 'byuṇ ba chen po la bži ni 'di ltar/ sa daṇ/ chu daṇ/ me daṇ/ rluṇ no//*

**B.4b)** Herein, there are four basic elements: earth (*paṭhavī*), water (*āpo*), fire (*tejo*), and air (*vayo*).

**B.4c)** (*Path* 237,14) What are the four primaries ? Earth-element, water-element, fire-element, air-element.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Here the Sav omits the definitions of the four basic elements given in the *Path* pp. 237,15–238,10.

**B.5a)** (D 179a5; Q 90b7) *'byuñ ba chen po las byuñ ba'i gzugs ni ñi śuñer drug ste/ 'di ltar ...*

**B.5b)** There are 26 [types of] form derived from the basic elements<sup>1</sup> ...

[See Table 1.]

**B.5c)** (*Path* 238,12) What are the derived material qualities ? ... [See Table 1.]

**B.6a)** (D 179a7; Q 91a3) *de'i phyir 'byuñ ba chen po bži dan ñe bar bslañ ba'i gzugs ñi śuñer drug ste/ gzugs (Q rdzas) sum cur 'gyur ro//*

**B.6b)** Therefore, there are four basic elements and 26 [types of] derived form (*upādāya-rūpa*), making 30 [types of] form (*rūpa*).<sup>2</sup>

**B.6c)** (*Path* 240,31) ... these 26 material qualities and the four primaries make up 30 kinds of matter [*rūpa*, PA].<sup>3</sup>

### C. Discussion

The earliest suttas, both Pāli and Sanskrit, speak of two types of form, generally in definitions of either the form aggregate (*rūpa-kkhandā*) or of the “form” in “name-and-form” (*nāma-rūpa*). For example:

<sup>1</sup> This introductory sentence is not given in the *Path*, which gives instead a question. In Table 1 I have omitted the *dan* (*ca*, “and”) that follows each item in the Tibetan.

<sup>2</sup> D *gzugs* = *rūpa*, Q *rdzas* = *dabba* (Skt *dravya*). The Chinese here definitely = *rūpa* [PA].

<sup>3</sup> This sentence follows the definitions of the 26 types of derived form that are given in the *Path* (pp. 238,20–240,31) but omitted in the Sav.

*Katamañ ca bhikkhave rūpam ? Cattāro ca mahābhūta catunnam ca mahābhūtanam upādāya rūpam, idam vuccati bhikkhave rūpam (SN III 59,19)*

What, O monks, is form ? The four basic elements and form derived from the four basic elements: this, O monks, is termed form.

While the four basic elements are listed and defined in the *suttas*, for example in the *Mahāhatthipadopama-sutta* (MN 28, Vol. I 185,14 foll.), no definition of “derived form” is given in the early texts. This gave the various schools a free hand to compile their own lists of the constituents of derived form.

The earliest list of the Mahāvihāravāsin Theravādins is found in their *Abhidhamma* in the *Dhammasaṅgani* (§ 596)<sup>1</sup> which gives 23 types of derived form in response to the question *katamam tam rūpam upādā*. This type of form became known as *upādā-* or *upādāya-rūpa*. The 23 types of derived form of the *Dhammasaṅgani* (indicated with an asterisk in Table 1) follow the same order as the corresponding items of the *Vimuttimagga* list.

From the time of Buddhaghosa on, the Mahāvihāravāsins added the “heart-base”, *hadaya-vatthu*, between no. 12, *jīvitindriya*, and no. 13, *kāyaviññatti*, to make a total of 24 varieties of derived form. This list is found, for example, in the *Visuddhimagga* (375 § 36; Mm 11,10).<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> References to this work are by section number, as given in the PTS edition (ed. Edward Müller, [1885] London, 1978) and in the Devanagari script edition (ed. P.V. Bapat and R.D. Vadekar, Poona, 1940).

<sup>2</sup> References to this work are to Henry Clarke Warren (ed.) and Dharmananda Kosambi (rev.), *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series 41), [1950] Delhi, 1989, by page and paragraph number, and to the Thai

Sav and the *Path*, however, state explicitly that there are 26 types of derived form (see above, §§ B.5ab and B.6abc).

The list of the Sav in fact gives 27 items; as may be seen from Table 1, I have not counted *reg pa* (= *phassa*), which is not given in the *Path* or in the following analysis and classification of the 26 types as cited in the Sav. As a *cetasika*, *phassa* does not belong here; if *phoṭṭhabba* (Tibetan *reg bya*) is intended, it also does not fit, because according to the *Vimuttimagga* as cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra himself (D 184b1; Q 97b8) the “tangible base” (*phoṭṭhabbāyatana*) consists of the earth, fire, air, and water elements, and hardness (*kakkhalatta*), softness (*mudutā*), heat (*unhatta*), and coolness (*sītata*), which are within the range of the body (*kāya-gocara*):

*reg bya'i skye mched ni sa'i khams dañ/ me'i khams dañ/ rluñ  
gi khams dañ/ chu'i khams dañ/ sra ba dañ/ 'jam pa dañ/ dro  
ba dañ/ bsil ba ste/ gañ lus kyi spyod yul lo//*

This definition is confirmed by the *Path* (254,19)<sup>1</sup>:

Touch-object is hardness, softness, coolness, and warmth of the elements of earth, water, fire, and air. This is the field of the body.<sup>2</sup>

---

script edition published by Mahāmakaṭarājavidyālaya (Mm), Bangkok, 2509 [1976] by page and line.

<sup>1</sup> The order of the four elements here in the *Path* agrees with that of both the Sav and the *Path* at B.4 above. This seems to be the standard order as found at e.g. DN III 228,1 and MN I 185,12.

<sup>2</sup> “Touch-object is the earth-element, water-°, fire-°, air-°, hardness, softness, coolness, and warmth [which are within] the range of the body (*kāya-gocara*)” [PA].

The Mahāvihāravāsins, however, hold that the *phoṭṭhabbāyatana* consists of only three great elements, excluding water, *āpo-dhātu*, and that cold, *sīta*, is not *āpo-dhātu* but *tejo-dhātu*, in the “condition of feeble heat” (*mande hi unhabhāve sītabuddhi*).<sup>1</sup> The position of the *Vimuttimagga* is closer to that of the Vaibhāśikas, who include all four elements as well as cold (*sīta*) in the *spraśtavyāyatana*.<sup>2</sup> Confirmed by both the Tibetan of the Sav and by the Chinese of the *Path*, the definition of *phoṭṭhabbāyatana* is another important point on which the tradition of the *Vimuttimagga* disagrees with the Mahāvihāra school.

When this error is corrected, the Sav and the *Path* agree completely on the 26 items enumerated and their order.<sup>3</sup> This list of 26 items may safely be termed the *Vimuttimagga* list of derived form.

A comparison of the *Dhammasaṅgāni* list with that of the *Vimuttimagga* shows that the two lists are identical in order and in items enumerated, with the important difference that the latter adds three items: *rūpassa jāti* (21), *vatthu-rūpa* (25), and *middha* (26).

Of these three, *vatthu-rūpa* may be identified with the *hadaya-vatthu* of the Mahāvihāravāsins from the time of Buddhaghosa on. Unfortunately, since Daśabalaśrīmitra’s presentation of the *Vimuttimagga* is abridged, he omits the definitions of the 26 varieties of derived form that follow the list in the full Chinese translation, and thus does not define *vatthu-rūpa*. In the *Path* (240,29) the definition of the equivalent term is translated as “the growth which is dependent on the primaries and the element of

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. *Dhammasaṅgāni* §§ 647–51 and Karunadasa 1967, pp. 19–20, 29–30.

<sup>2</sup> cf. P. Pradhan (ed.), *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series VIII, 2nd edition), Patna, 1975, I,10d, p. 7,8.

<sup>3</sup> The basic list in the *Path* gives 25 items only, omitting the important no. 21, “birth of matter”, which is, however, given in the Chinese (see note 5 to Table 1).

consciousness [*viññāna-dhātu*, PA] is called the sense-organ of the material element”,<sup>1</sup> which is not very illuminating.

That *hadaya-vatthu* and *vatthu-rūpa* are equivalent is, however, made clear in the *Atthakathā* and later literature, for example in the definition of the “base-decad”, *vatthu-dasaka*, given in the *Vibhaṅga-atthakathā* (Vibh-a 22,7-10):

*Tattha vatthurūpam, tassa nissayāni cattāri mahābhūtāni, tannissitā vaṇṇa-gandha-rasa-ojā jīvitam ti, idam vatthudasakam nāma.*

Herein, the base-decad consists of *vatthu-rūpa*, the four basic elements on which it depends, colour, odour, taste, and nutriment that depend on it, and life.

The Sav does not give the definition of the “base-decad”, but refers it to that of the “eye-decad”:

(D 179b6; Q 91b4) *de la mig bcu žes pa ni/ rab tu dañ ba'i mig gi dños por gyur pa'i 'byuñ ba chen po bži dañ/ kha dog dañ/ dri dañ/ ro dañ/ gzi brgyid dañ/ srog gi dbañ po dañ/ mig gi rab tu dañ ba'o// chos bcu po 'di rnams gnas rnam pa tha dad med pa'i goñ bu yin pas/ mig bcu žes brjod do// ... (D 180a4; Q 92a4) de bžin du rna ba bcu ldan dañ/ sna bcu ldan dañ/ lce bcu ldan dañ/ lus bcu ldan dañ/ bud med kyi dbañ po bcu ldan dañ/ skyes pa'i dbañ po bcu ldan dañ/ dños po bcu ldan dañ/ srog gi dbañ po bcu ldan rnams rgyas par šes par bya'o//*

<sup>1</sup> “Sense-organ of the material element” = *vatthu-rūpa*: the definition belongs to the *vatthu-rūpa* of the preceding list (Table 1, § 25), and the characters are nearly the same [PA].

Herein, that which is called the “eye-decad” (*cakkhu-dasaka*) consists of the four basic elements, colour, odour, taste, nutriment (*ojā*), life-element, and the sensitive eye-tissue (*cakkhu-pasāda*) that make up the substance of the sensitive eye. Because these ten *dharmas* are a physically undifferentiated conglomeration (*pīḍa*), they are called the “eye-decad” .... The ear-decad, the nose-decad, the tongue-decad, the body-decad, the femininity-faculty-decad, the masculinity-faculty-decad, the base-decad (*vatthu-dasaka*), and the life-faculty-decad [correct to “ennead”]<sup>1</sup> should be understood in detail in the same manner.

(Path 242,1) What is the eye-decad ? The four elements of eye-sentience are its basis. And again, it consists of the four

<sup>1</sup> “Life-faculty decad”, *srog gi dbañ po bcu ldan*, must be an error of scribe or translator. In the Pāli Abhidhamma, the life-faculty is an ennead (*jīvitindriyanavaka*); for it to be a decad, one would have to count the life-faculty twice. Furthermore, the ennead is referred to later on in the Sav: (D 180b4; Q 92b7) *tshañ pa rnams kyi skye ba'i dus su gzugs sum cu dgu ni 'di lta ste/ dños po bcu ldan dañ/ mig bcu ldan dañ/ rna ba bcu ldan dañ/ srog gi dbañ po dgu ldan no// 'du šes med pa'i sems can rnams kyi skye ba'i dus su gzugs dgu 'byuñ bar 'gyur te 'di ltar srog gi dbañ po dgu'o//* “For Brahma at the moment of birth there are 39 [constituents of] form: the base-decad, the eye-decad, the ear-decad, and the life-faculty-ennead (*jīvitindriya-navaka*). For beings without perception (*asaññi-satta*) at the moment of birth 9 [constituents of] form arise, that is, the life-faculty-ennead.” Path p. 244,6 has “Brahmā arouses 49 material qualities at the moment of birth. They are the basis-decad, the eye-decad, the ear-decad, the body-decad, and the life-principle-ennead” for the first part. The figure 39 of the Sav is correct, since the *Abhidhammatha-saṅgaha* (Mm 38,8; Nārada 312,1) states that since the nose-, tongue-, body-, and sex-decad are not found in the world of form, that is the Brahmaloka, at the moment of birth there are four *kalāpas*, the eye-, ear-, and base-decad, plus the life-ennead: *rūpaloke pana ghāna-jivhā-kāya-bhāva-dasakāni ... na labbhanti, tasmā tesam patisandhi-kāle cakkhu-sota-vatthu-vasena tiñi dasakāni jīvita-navakañceti cattāro kamma-samūthāna-kalāpā ... labbhanti.*

primaries, form, odour, flavour, contact,<sup>1</sup> life-principle and the sentient eye. This decad is produced together and does not separate. This is called “group” and this is called the eye-decad ... (242,16). Thus should the eye-decad be known. In the same way one should know the ear-decad, the nose-decad, the tongue-decad, the body-decad, femininity-decad, masculinity-decad, life-principle-enned at length.

It is possible that the term *vatthu-rūpa* is older than the term *hadaya-vatthu*. The latter only appears from the time of Buddhaghosa onwards, while *vatthu-rūpa* is employed in the earlier *Vimuttimagga* as well as in later works of the Mahāvihāravāsins.

The importance of *vatthu-rūpa* or *hadaya-vatthu* in Theravādin philosophy is demonstrated by the fact that it makes up one of the two essential decads that must arise at the moment of birth:

(D 180a6; Q 92a6) *mñal gyi skye ba'i skad cig la gzugs sum cu 'byun bar 'gyur ro// dños po bcu ldn dan/ lus bcu ldn dan/ gañ gi tshe bud med na (D ni) bud med kyi dbañ po bcu ldn dan/ yan na skyes par (D skye bar) 'gyur na de'i tshe skyes pa'i dbañ po bcu ldn dan/ ma niñ rnams kyi ni gzugs ñi šu 'byun bar 'gyur te/ 'di lta ste/ dños po bcu ldn dan/ lus bcu ldn no//*

Thirty [categories of] form arise at the moment of birth in a womb (*gabbha*): the base-decad (*vatthu-dasaka*), the body-decad (*kāya-dasaka*), plus, for a female, the femininity-faculty-decad (*itthindriya-dasaka*), or, for a male, the masculinity-faculty-decad (*purisindriya-dasaka*). For asexuals (*napuñsaka*),

<sup>1</sup> Here the Chinese has *phassa* against the *ojā* (*gzi brgyid*) of the Tibetan [PA]. The latter is correct.

twenty [categories of] form arise [at the moment of birth]: the base-decad and the body-decad.

(*Path* 243,16) How, through birth? It should be known by way of a male or female entering a womb. In the first moment thirty material qualities are produced. They are the basis-decad, body-decad, femininity-decad, masculinity-decad. In the case of a person who is neither a male nor a female, twenty material qualities are produced. They are the basis-decad and the body-decad.

The same theory is given in the *Vibhaṅga-attīhakathā* (Vibh-a p. 22) and the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* (Mm 37,15; Nārada 311,10, *gabbha-seyyaka-sattānam pana kāya-bhāva-vatthu-dasaka-saṅkhātāni tiñi dasakāni pātubhavanti, tatthā pi bhāva-dasakām kadāci na labbhati*).

*Vatthu-rūpa*, along with its opposite *avatthu-rūpa*, is used in another sense in the Pāli Abhidhamma, as one of the classifications of form. The *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* (Mm 34,20; Nārada 296,19) defines the term in this sense as follows:

*Pasāda-hadaya-saṅkhātām chabbidham pi vatthu-rūpan-nāma, itaram avatthu-rūpan-nāma.*

Form as “base” [for consciousness] is six-fold, consisting of what is called *pasāda* [the five sense bases] and the heart-base. The rest are “form as non-base”.

This classification derives from the list of synonyms given for the five sense bases in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* (§§ 597 foll.): *loka, dvāra ... khetta, vatthu*, etc. The *Visuddhimagga* (382 § 78; Mm 21,15) notes that the five sense bases are both “base” and “door” (*pasāda-rūpan vatthuñ c' eva*

*dvārañ ca*), while the heart-base, which is not given in the *Dhammasaṅgañi*, is a “base” but not a “door” (*yam pan’ ettha hadaya-rūpañ nāma tam vatthu na dvāram*).

After defining the 24 types of derived form accepted by the Mahāvihāravāsins, Buddhaghosa, in his *Visuddhimagga* (381 § 71; Mm 19,10), goes on to say:

*Imāni tāva pāliyam āgatarūpān’ eva. Aṭṭhakathāyam pana bala-rūpañ sambhava-rūpañ jāti-rūpañ roga-rūpan ti ekaccānam matena middha-rūpan ti evam aññāni pi rūpāni āharitvā “addhā munī ‘si sambuddho n’ atthi nīvaraṇā tāvā” ti ādīni vatvā middha-rūpañ tāva natthi yevā ti paṭikkhittam. Itaresu roga-rūpañ jaratā-aniccatā-gahañena gahitam eva, jāti-rūpañ upacaya-santatiggahañena, sambhava-rūpañ āpodhātuggahañena, bala-rūpañ vāyodhātuggahañena gahitam eva. Tasmā tesu ekam pi visum n’ atthi ti sannīthānam gatañ. Iti idam catuvīsatī-vidham upādāya-rūpañ pubbe vuttam catubbidha-bhūtarūpañ ca ti atthavīsatī-vidham rūpañ hoti anūnam-anadikam.*

Only this many [types of] form are given in the Pāli [i.e. in the *Tipiṭaka*.<sup>1</sup> In the *Aṭṭhakathā*, however, other [types of] form are brought in: *bala-rūpa*, *sambhava-rūpa*, *jāti-rūpa*, *roga-rūpa*, and, in the opinion of some, *middha-rūpa*. [Because the Abhidhamma states that form is not to be abandoned, *apahātabba*, while torpor, as one of the hindrances, *nīvaraṇa*, is to be abandoned, as the verse says:]

“Surely you are a sage, fully enlightened:

<sup>1</sup> As noted above, the sole canonical source, the *Dhammasaṅgañi*, lists only 23.

there are no hindrances in you”,<sup>1</sup>

*middha-rūpa*, physical torpor, is rejected as simply non-existent. As for the others, *roga-rūpa* is included in the categories of decay and impermanence; *jāti-rūpa*, “birth of form” belongs to the categories of growth and continuity; *sambhava-rūpa* is included under the water-element; and *bala-rūpa* is included under the air-element. Therefore it is definitely understood that not one of these exists independently. Thus these 24 types of derived form and the previously mentioned fourfold elemental form make 28 types of form, no more and no less.

From this passage several important conclusions may be drawn. Firstly, the *jāti-rūpa* or *rūpassa jāti*<sup>2</sup> of the *Vimuttimagga* list was not accepted by the Mahāvihāravāsins as a separate or distinct entity, although, since it was mentioned in an unnamed *Aṭṭhakathā* it was acceptable as a concept for the growth and continuity of form. (A similar interpretation is given in the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha*, Mm 34,10, Nārada 286,7, *jāti-rūpañ eva pan’ ettha upacaya-santati-nāmena pavuccatī ti*.) Secondly, *middha-rūpa*, “physical torpor” — described significantly not as from the *Aṭṭhakathā* but as according to “the opinion of some” — was rejected outright.

From this we see that the *Vimuttimagga* disagrees with the Mahāvihāravāsin tradition on one of the most fundamental categories of the Abhidhamma, the definition of form, by including two extra items: the conventionally acceptable *rūpassa jāti* and the totally unacceptable *middha-rūpa*. The *Vimuttimagga* thereby gives a total of 26 varieties of

<sup>1</sup> Citation from *Sutta-nipāta* v. 541cd.

<sup>2</sup> I take these two terms to be equivalent. For the *gzugs kyi skye ba* of the *Sav I* have given *rūpassa jāti* on the analogy of the *rūpassa upacaya*, etc., of the Pāli.

derived form. The *Visuddhimagga*, however, states emphatically that only 24 varieties are found in the Pāli, and that, added to the four great elements, these make a total of 28 constituents of the form aggregate, *no more and no less*, against the *Vimuttimagga* total of 30.

Although the *Visuddhimagga* attributes the “heresy” of *middharūpa* to the opinion of an unspecified “some” (*ekaccānam matena*), the *Tīkā* tells us that this refers to the Abhayagirivāsins: *ekaccānan ti abhayagiri-vāsīnam*.<sup>1</sup> Thus the inclusion of *middha-rūpa* in both the Chinese version and the Tibetan extracts of the *Vimuttimagga* is convincing evidence that the *Vimuttimagga* contains classifications that were categorically rejected by the Mahāvihāra but accepted by the Abhayagiri school.

Following the list of the 30 constituents of the form-aggregate, the *Vimuttimagga* classifies them according to the various categories of the Abhidhamma. The classifications of the three “extra” (from the standpoint of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*) items of the *Vimuttimagga* list that can be extracted from Daśabalaśrīmitra’s abridged citation are given in Table 2.

The classification of *vatthu-rūpa* agrees with that given for *hadaya-vatthu* in the *Visuddhimagga* and other Mahāvihāravāsin texts. Thus the *Vimuttimagga* and the Mahāvihāravāsins agree on these points. Since the latter reject both *middha* and *rūpassa jāti*, they do not include them in their scheme of classification.

The classification into *upādiṇṇa*, etc., reads as follows:

<sup>1</sup> *Paramatthamañjusāya nāma Visuddhimagga-saṃvaṇṇanāya Mahātīkā-sammatāya tatiyo bhāgo*, Mahāmakuṭarājavidyālaya, Bangkok, 2508 [1965], p. 48,2.

(D 181a2; Q 93a7) *yañ gzugs thams cad ni rnam pa gsum ste 'di ltar/ zin pa'i gzugs dañ/ ma zin pa'i gzugs dañ/ rnam par phye ba'i gzugs so//*

1) *de la las las skies pas zin pa'i gzugs la dgu ste 'di ltar/ dbañ po'i gzugs brgyad dañ/ dños po'i no bo'o//*

2) *las las ma skies pa'i don gyis ma zin pa'i gzugs la (Q om. la) dgu ni 'di ltar/ sgra dañ/ lus kyi rnam par (Q om. rnam par) rig byed dañ/ ñag gi rnam par rig byed (Q rnam rig only) dañ/ gzugs kyi yañ ba ñid dañ/ gzugs kyi 'jam pa ñid dañ/ las su ruñ ba dañ/ rga ba dañ/ mi rtag pa dañ/ gñid do//*

3) *gñi ga yin pa'i don gyis rnam par phye ba'i gzugs la bcu gñis ni 'di ltar/ lhag ma gzugs bcu gñis so//*

Furthermore, all form (*sabbam rūpam*) is of three types: *upādiṇṇa-rūpa*, *anupādiṇṇa-rūpa*,<sup>1</sup> and *\*vibhutta-rūpa*.<sup>2</sup>

1) Herein, *upādiṇṇa-rūpa*, which arises from kamma (*kammaja*), is of 9 [types]: the 8 [types of] form which are faculties

<sup>1</sup> *Zin pa-ma zin pa* are the regular Tibetan equivalents of the technical terms *upātta-anupātta* of the Vaibhāśikas. As noted by Karunadasa (1967, pp. 103 foll.), *upātta-anupātta* as employed in the *Abhidharmakośa* have a different meaning from the *upādiṇṇa-anupādiṇṇa* of the Theravādin Abhidhamma. However, since the classifications and definitions as *kammaja*, etc., agree with those of the Pāli, and since *zin pa*, “grasped, appropriated”, etc., means the same as *upādiṇṇa*, there can be no doubt that these are the correct equivalents in this context.

<sup>2</sup> *Rnam par phye ba* is the usual Tibetan equivalent of *vibhajya*; Hirakawa et al. (p. 157) also give *vibhakta*, *vipañcita*, and *viyukta*; Yamaguchi (p. 129) gives *vikalpitu*, *vibhāga*; Mvy 6838 *vicita*. The PTSD (p. 629) has “divided, distributed, parted, partitioned, having divisions ...” for *vibhutta*; since it does not seem to be a technical term in Pāli, this is a tentative equivalent.

(*indriya-rūpa*: eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, femininity, masculinity, life) plus *vatthu-rūpa*.

2) In the sense of not arising from kamma (*akamma-jāṭhena*), *anupādinna-rūpa* is of 9 [types]: sound (*sadda*), bodily expression (*kāya-viññatti*), vocal expression (*vaci-viññatti*), lightness of form (*rūpassa lahutā*), plasticity of form (*rūpassa mudutā*), wieldiness (*kammaññatā*), decay (*jarā*), impermanence, (*aniccatā*), and torpor (*middha*).

3) In the sense of being both (*ubhayatthena*), \**vibhutta-rūpa* is of 12 types, that is, the remaining 12 [types of] form.

The Chinese version as given in the *Path* (244,28), while revealing some difficulties in translation, agrees with the Sav:

All material qualities can be divided into three kinds. They are non-material qualities and arrested material qualities.<sup>1</sup>

1) Here nine material qualities are feeling [*upādinna*, PA]. They are the eight faculties and the material basis, because they are produced owing to kamma-result.

2) Nine material qualities are<sup>2</sup> the sense-object of sound, body-intimation, speech-intimation, buoyancy of matter, impressibility of matter, workability of matter, decay of matter, impermanency

<sup>1</sup> The *Path* garbles the text. “They are *upādinna*, *anupādinna*, and ‘perishable’” [PA]. The last, “perishable” presumably translates a form in *BHAÑJ* against the *BHAJ* of the Tibetan.

<sup>2</sup> “Nine material qualities are *anupādinna*:” ... [PA]. The *Path* omits *anupādinna*.

of matter and torpidity. These are not produced through kamma-result.

3) The other twelve material qualities are breakable ones because they have two kinds of significance (?).<sup>1</sup>

The classification into *upādinna*–*anupādinna* is given only as a *duka-mātikā* in the *Dhammasaṅgani* (§§ 585, 653–54); however, as the group from *rūpāyatana* to *kabalīṅkāra āhāra* is given under both categories, this implies the third \**vibhutta* category of the *Vimuttimagga*. The itemisation of the *Vimuttimagga* and the *Dhammasaṅgani* is otherwise identical, except, of course, that the former adds *vatthu-rūpa*, *rūpassa jāti*, and *middha*.

The passage on *sabhāva-rūpa*, etc., reads as follows:

(D 181a7; Q 93b6) yañ gzugs thams cad la rnam pa lñā<sup>2</sup> ni 'di ltar rañ bžin gyi gzugs dañ/ rnam par 'gyur ba'i gzugs dañ/ mtshan ñid kyi (Q om. kyi) gzugs dañ/ yoñs su chad pa'i gzugs so//

1) de la yoñs su rdzogs pa'i don gyis rañ bžin gyi gzugs la dbye ba bcu dgu (D dgu bcu [!]) ste/ 'di ltar/ gañ rags pa'i gzugs su gsuñs ba'i bcu gñis po de dañ/ bud med kyi dbañ po dañ/ skyes pa'i dbañ po dañ/ srog gi dbañ po dañ/ chu'i khams dañ/ kham gyi zas dañ/ dños po'i no bo dañ/ gñid (Q ñid) do//

<sup>1</sup> The uncertainty is expressed by the translators of the *Path*. The Chinese agrees with the Tibetan: “in the sense of being both” (*ubhayatthena*) [PA]. That is, the items of the last category are both *upādinna* and *anupādinna*.

<sup>2</sup> The text states “five (*lñā*)”, but lists only four, as do the *Path* and the *Visuddhimagga*; thus “five” must be an error.

2) *rañ bzin gyi gzugs rnam par 'gyur ba'i don gyis rnam par 'gyur ba'i gzugs la bdun ni 'di ltar/ lus kyi rnam par rig byed dañ/ ñag gi rnam par rig byed dañ/ gzugs kyi yañ ba ñid dañ/ gzugs kyi 'jam pa ñid dañ/ las su ruñ ba ñid dañ/ gzugs kyi 'phel ba dañ/ gzugs kyi rgyud do//*

3) *'dus byas kyi don gyis (Q adds na) mtshan ñid kyi gzugs la gsum ni 'di ltar/ gzugs kyi skye ba dañ/ gzugs kyi rga ba dañ/ gzugs kyi mi rtag pa'o//*

4) *tshogs pa yoñs su chad pa'i don gyis yoñs su chad pa'i gzugs gcig ni 'di ltar/ nam mkha'i khams so// 'dir rañ bzin gyi gzugs gañ yin pa de (D de'i) yoñs su chad pa yin gyi lhag ma ni yoñs su ma chad pa'o//*

Furthermore, all form (*sabbam rūpam*) is of four<sup>1</sup> types: intrinsic form (*sabhāva-rūpa*), transforming form (*vikāra-rūpa*), characterising form (*lakkhaṇa-rūpa*), and delimiting form (*pariccheda-rūpa*).

1) Herein, in the sense of being absolute (*parinipphannaṭṭhena*),<sup>2</sup> there are 19 categories (*bheda*) of intrinsic form: the 12 that have been taught as coarse form (*olārika-rūpa*), the femininity-faculty, the masculinity-faculty, the life-faculty, the water-element (*āpo-dhātu*), nutrient (*kabañkāra-āhāra*), *vatthu-rūpa*, and torpor (*middha*).

<sup>1</sup> See preceding note.

<sup>2</sup> *Yoñs su rdzogs pa* = *parinippanna*, *paripūrṇa*, etc., Hirakawa et al. p. 262. While *nipphanna* is the preferred term in the Pāli Abhidhamma, *parinipphanna* is also used, for example in the *Atthasālini*: cf. Karunadasa 1967, p. 42.

2) In the sense of transforming intrinsic form (*sabhāva-rūpa-vipariñamanaṭṭhena*),<sup>1</sup> transforming form is of 7 [types]: bodily expression, vocal expression, lightness of form, plasticity of form, wieldiness, growth of form, and continuity of form.

3) In the sense of being conditioned (*saṅkhataṭṭhena*), characterising form is of three [types]: birth of form, decay of form, and impermanence of form.

4) In the sense of delimiting an aggregation (*kalāpa-paricchedaṭṭhena*),<sup>2</sup> there is one delimiting form: the space-element (*ākāsa-dhātu*). Herein, essential form is delimited (*paricchinnna*); the remainder (*sesa*) are not delimited (*aparicchinnna*).

(*Path* 245,8) Again, all material qualities are of four kinds, by way of intrinsic nature of matter [*sabhāva-rūpa*, PA], material form, material characteristics [*lakkhaṇa-rūpa*, PA], and delimitation of matter [*pariccheda-rūpa*, PA].<sup>3</sup>

1) Here 19 material qualities are intrinsic [*sabhāva*, PA]. They are the 12 gross material qualities, femininity, masculinity, life-

<sup>1</sup> This is tentative: *rnam par 'gyur ba* = *vipariñāma*, *vikāra*, Hirakawa et al. pp. 155–56; *vikṛti*, Yamaguchi p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> *Tshogs (pa)* = *kalāpa*, *saṅghāta*, *samudāya*, *samūha*, *sāmagrī*, etc., Hirakawa et al. p. 225: the reference is to the Abhidhammic atom, *rūpa-kalāpa*, for which see Karunadasa 1967, Ch. VIII, and especially p. 152, “Every *rūpa-kalāpa* is delimited (*paricchindate*) by the environing *ākāsa*, space”.

<sup>3</sup> The first term, *sabhāva-rūpa*, is clear. The second might be equivalent to *vikāra-* or *vipariñamana-rūpa*. The third should be “characterising form” (*lakkhaṇa-rūpa*) rather than the “material characteristics” of the *Path*, and the fourth “delimiting form” (*pariccheda-rūpa*) rather than “delimitation of matter” [PA].

principle, element of water, solid food, material basis, and material quality of eye,<sup>1</sup> because they limit (?).<sup>2</sup>

2) Seven material qualities are material form. They are body-intimation, speech-intimation, buoyancy of matter, impressibility of matter, workability of matter, integration of matter, continuity of matter, and intrinsic nature of matter, because they change.<sup>3</sup>

3) Three material qualities are material characteristics [*lakkhana-rūpa*, PA]. They are birth of matter, decay of matter, and impermanency of matter, because they are conditioned.

4) One material quality is delimitation of matter [*pariccheda-rūpa*, PA]. It is space-element, because it defines the groups.<sup>4</sup> Here, through intrinsic nature one discriminates, not through the others.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “Material quality of eye” in fact represents *middha*, as in the Tibetan. One of the Chinese terms for *middha* is the character for “eye”: see Akira Hirakawa et al., *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhasya* (Peking Edition), Part One, Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese, Tokyo, 1973, p. 295 [PA].

<sup>2</sup> The uncertainty is expressed by the translators of the *Path*. The character rendered as “limit (?)” also means “definite”, “ultimate” (*atyanta, accanta*): see William Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*, [London, 1937] Delhi, 1987, 361a [PA]. The definition is probably equal to the Tibetan, “in the sense of being absolute”.

<sup>3</sup> The Chinese lists only the seven items of the Tibetan. “Intrinsic nature of matter” (= *sabhāva-rūpa*) belongs to the concluding statement, which agrees roughly with the Tibetan [PA].

<sup>4</sup> “Because it defines the groups” = “in the sense of delimiting an aggregation” of the Tibetan; the Pāli here would also be *kalāpa-paricchedanāthena* [PA].

<sup>5</sup> The Chinese of this sentence again corresponds exactly to the Tibetan: “Herein, essential form is delimited (*paricchinna*); the remainder (*sesa*) are not delimited (*aparicchinna*)” [PA].

A similar fourfold classification is given in the *Visuddhimagga* (382 § 77; Mm 21,12):

*Nipphanna-rūpam pan' ettha rūpa-rūpam nāma ākāsa-dhātu pariccheda-rūpam nāma kāyaviññatti ādi kammaññatā-pariyantam vikāra-rūpam nāma jāti-jarā-bhaṅgam lakkhaṇa-rūpam nāmā ti evam rūparūpādi-catukka-vasena catubbidham.*

Absolute form [18 items: 4 elements, 13 starting with the eye, plus nutriment] is “form as form”; the space-element is “delimiting form”; from bodily expression to wieldiness are “transforming form”; birth, decay, and destruction are “characterising form”. Thus, form is fourfold through the four groups starting with “form as form”.

The *rūpa-rūpa* of Buddhaghosa is equivalent to the *sabhāva-rūpa* of the *Vimuttimagga* and consists of the same items, except that the latter adds *middha*. Buddhaghosa equates *rūpa-rūpa* with *nipphanna-rūpa*, which he defines as *sabhāveneva pariggahetabbo*, “to be comprehended in its intrinsic nature”. At a later date, Anuruddha, in his *Abhidhammatthasangaha* (Mm 34,5; Nārada 285,22), gives *sabhāva-rūpa* as the preferred name for this category, thus agreeing with the *Vimuttimagga*.<sup>1</sup>

#### D. A note on the heart-basis in the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*

To return to the theory of the heart basis, we may note that it was also known to other North Indian sources, for example the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* of Yaśomitra and the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi* of Hsüan-tsang.<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>1</sup> cf. Karunadasa 1967, pp. 42 foll. for a thorough study of the concept of *nipphanna-rūpa* and its implications.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of Yaśomitra’s reference, see Skilling 1993B.

the latter, the theory of the heart-basis, without being named as such, is attributed to the Sthaviras:

Les Sthaviras disent qu'il y a dans la poitrine un *rūpa*, un *rūpadravya*, analogue à l'oeil, etc., qui sert d'*indriya* au *manovijñāna*.<sup>1</sup>

The Sthaviras say that there is within the bosom of every sentient being a *rūpa*, a *rūpadravya*, something substantial, analogous to the eye, etc., which serves as the *indriya* of *manovijñāna*.<sup>2</sup>

If the use of the Sanskrit technical term *indriya* here is correct, it does not agree with either the *Vimuttimagga* or the Mahāvihāra tradition. For the former we have the following passage:

(D 181a1; Q 93a5) *gžan yañ gzugs la rnam pa gñis ni 'di ltar/ dbañ po'i gzugs dañ/ dbañ po min pa'i gzugs so// de la bdag po'i don gyis (Q gyi) dbañ po'i gzugs la bryad ni 'di ltar/ mig dañ/ rna ba dañ/ sna dañ/ lce dañ/ lus dañ/ bud med kyi dbañ po dañ/ skyes pa'i dbañ po dañ/ srog gi dbañ po'o// dbañ po dañ mi ldan pa'i don gyis dbañ po min pa'i gzugs la ñi šu ñer gñis te 'di ltar// gzugs lhag ma rnams so//*

Furthermore, there are two types of form: form as faculty (*indriya-rūpa*) and form as non-faculty (*anindriya-rūpa*).

<sup>1</sup> Louis de La Vallée Poussin (tr.), *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, la Siddhi de Huian-Tsang*, Vol. I, Paris, 1928, p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> Wei Tat (tr.), *Ch'eng Wei-Shih Lun, The Doctrine of Mere-Consciousness*, Hong Kong, 1976, p. 327. Although Wei Tat's version is purportedly rendered directly from the Chinese, in the present case it seems to be dependent on La Vallée Poussin, particularly for the Sanskrit terms.

Herein, in the sense of exercising sovereignty (*adhipatiyatthena*), there are 8 [types of] form as faculty: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and body, the femininity-faculty, masculinity-faculty, and life-faculty. In the sense of not possessing faculties<sup>1</sup> there are 22 [types of] form that are non-faculty, that is, the remaining [types of] form.

(*Path* 244,21) And again, there are two kinds. They are faculty and non-faculty.<sup>2</sup> Here 8 material qualities are faculty. They are the five internals (possibly, five sentient organs),<sup>3</sup> the faculty of femininity, of masculinity, and life; they are so because of dependence. The other 22 are non-faculty, because they are non-dependent.

For the Mahāvihāra, this distinction goes back to the *Dhammasaṅgani* (§§ 661–62):

*Katamam tam rūpam indriyam ? Cakkhu-indriyam sotindriyam ghānindriyam jivhindriyam kāyindriyam itthindriyam purisindriyam jīvitindriyam, idam tam rūpam indriyam.*

*Katamam tam rūpam na indriyam ? Rupāyatanañ ... pe ... kabaliñkāro āhāro, idam tam rūpam na indriyam.*

<sup>1</sup> *Dbañ po dañ mi ldan pa'i don gyis*: it is possible that *dbañ po* = *indriya* (in both D and Q) is a mistake for *bdag po* = *adhipati*, as in the definition of *indriya-rūpa*.

<sup>2</sup> As noted by the translators of the *Path* (p. 244, note 1), the Chinese in fact has "Lit. Life-faculty and non-life-faculty" [*jīvitindriya*, *ajīvitindriya*, PA] throughout. It is clear that the term equals the *indriya* of the Tibetan.

<sup>3</sup> This is the translators' parenthesis. As seen from the Tibetan, the reference is to the five "internal" faculties: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, and body.

As mentioned above, however, the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* does not include *hadaya-vatthu* in its list of form. That it is not *indriya-rūpa* is made clear by the *Visuddhimagga* (381 § 73; Mm 20,14):

*Pasādarūpam* [= *cakkhādi pañcavidham rūpam*] *eva itthindriyādittayena saddhiṁ adhipatiyaṭṭhena indriyam, sesam tato viparītattā anindriyam.*

Just the form of the [5] sense-organs together with the three starting with the femininity-faculty are faculty, in the sense of exercising sovereignty; the remaining [22 faculties] are non-faculty for the opposite reason [that is, because they do not exercise sovereignty].

I may note here that the *adhipatiyaṭṭhena* of the *Visuddhimagga* is directly equivalent to the *bdag po'i don gyis* of the Sav. Again, we find the same classification in the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* (Mm 35,2; Nārada 296,23):

*Pasāda-bhāva-jīvita-saṅkhātam aṭṭhavidham pi indriyarūpam, itaram anindriyarūpam.*

Form as faculty is eightfold: that known as the [5] sense-organs, the [2] sex-faculties, and the life-faculty. The rest are form as non-faculty.

Thus it is clear that for both the *Vimuttimagga* and the Mahāvihāra *vatthu-rūpa* or *hadaya-vatthu* was *anindriya-rūpa*. An interesting explanation for this is put forward by Y. Karunadasa, who writes that unlike the sense-organs, the *hadaya-vatthu* “is not an *indriya*. Because of this reason, although *mano* and *mano-viññāna* have *hadaya-vatthu* as their basis, they are not controlled by it in the sense that the relative

strength or weakness of the latter does not influence the former. Since mental culture is a central theme in Buddhism, the scholiasts seem to have taken the view that it is not proper to conceive *mano* and *mano-viññāna* as controlled by the *hadaya-vatthu*, although the latter is recognised as the physical basis of the former”.<sup>1</sup>

### E. Conclusions

There is on-going debate about the school affiliation of the *Vimuttimagga*. While it is accepted that the text belongs to the broader Theravādin tradition, there is disagreement as to whether or not it can be associated with the Abhayagirivāsins.<sup>2</sup> My own conclusion — based primarily on the sections of the *Vimuttimagga* discussed in this article — is that it may indeed be associated with that school. My evidence and arguments are as follows:

1) The *Vimuttimagga* clearly belongs to the Theravādin tradition, and therefore should belong to either the Mahāvihāra, the Abhayagiri, or the Jetavaniya school.

2) The *Vimuttimagga* cannot have been transmitted by the post-Buddhaghosa Mahāvihāra, since it disagrees with the texts of that school on a number of points, such as the important definition of one of the four elements and the inclusion of *rūpassa jāti* and *middha* as an elemental form.<sup>3</sup> The passages translated above or given in Table 2 on the classification of *rūpassa jāti* and *middha-rūpa* show that they are fully

<sup>1</sup> Karunadasa 1967, p. 65.

<sup>2</sup> See Norman 1983, p. 29 and accompanying note, and pp. 159–60. The most recent contribution to the debate is Norman 1991, pp. 41–50, which gives an extensive bibliography.

<sup>3</sup> For other points on which the *Vimuttimagga* disagrees with the Mahāvihāra, see P.V. Bapat, *Vimuktimārga Dhutaguṇa-nirdeśa*, Bombay, 1964, pp. xviii–xix.

integrated into the system of the *Vimuttimagga*. Furthermore, while the Mahāvihāra rejected *middharūpa* categorically, in the *Vimuttimagga* it is classified as a *sabhāva-rūpa*, the most substantial type of derived form, thus placing it ontologically on a par with the four elements, the five sense-bases, and the five sense-objects.

3) None of this information is new, since it has long been available in the Chinese *Vimuttimagga* itself and in English translation in the *Path*. However, the fact that the material on *middha-rūpa* is confirmed perfectly by a North Indian text in Tibetan translation has not been previously noted. The inclusion and description of *middha-rūpa* as a type of derived form in the *Vimuttimagga* is thus solidly based on two versions separated by thousands of kilometres and about six centuries.

4) These are not, as suggested by some scholars, minor points.<sup>1</sup> According to the Theravādin Abhidhamma tradition, there are four ultimates (*paramattha*): mind (*citta*), mental states (*cetasika*), form (*rūpa*), and nibbāna.<sup>2</sup> When the *Vimuttimagga* disagrees with the Mahāvihāra tradition on the definitions of both constituents of one of these ultimates, form — of the four basic elements and of derived form — this is a major point of contention. The fact that Buddhaghosa takes pains to discuss *rūpassa jāti* and *middha-rūpa* in his *Visuddhimagga*, and that he is so emphatic about the numbers of types of derived form, itself shows that this was a controversial point.

<sup>1</sup> See for example Nāṇamoli, Introduction p. xxviii: “That [the *Vimuttimagga*] contains some minor points accepted by the Abhayagiri Monastery does not necessarily imply that it had any special connexion with that centre ... the disputed points are not schismatical”. Nāṇamoli’s statement is cited and approved at *Path* xxxvii; see also *Path* xxxii–xxxiii.

<sup>2</sup> *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, Mm 1,6, Nārada 6,10.

5) Buddhaghosa attributes the theory of *middha-rūpa* to an anonymous “some”; the *Tīkā* specifies that this refers to the adherents of the Abhayagiri tradition, which eliminates the Jetavaniyas. This statement may, of course, be wrong, since no commentator is infallible. However, since the author of the *Tīkā* was a learned Theravādin monk writing in Ceylon, where we know that the different schools lived in close proximity, I see no basis for reasonable doubt, and assume that he is correct in attributing the theory of *middha-rūpa* to the Abhayagiri.<sup>1</sup>

6) It is sometimes suggested that the *Vimuttimagga* cannot belong to the Abhayagiri because it shows no sign of Mahāyāna influence. This is beside the point: as an Abhidhammic meditation manual, there is no reason that it should. Monks of the Abhayagiri tradition who practised the Mahāyāna would have been defined as Abhayagirivāsin by their Vinaya lineage; whether or not they composed their own “Mahāyānist” texts cannot be said, but they would certainly not have tampered with the ancient literature of the school. At any rate, Bechert (1992) has shown that “Mahāyānist” ideas are present in such Mahāvihāra texts as the *Buddhavamsa*, *Cariyāpiṭaka*, and *Buddhāpadāna*: the absence or presence of such ideas tells us nothing about school-affiliation within the greater Theravādin lineage.

<sup>1</sup> The authors of the *Tīkās* certainly had access to Vaibhāṣika texts — which are paraphrased in Pāli in some of their works (for example, Vaibhāṣika explanations of the number and order of the 22 faculties [*indriya*] given in the *Visuddhimagga-tīkā*, *Vibhaṅga-anuṭīkā*, and *Abhidhammattha-vibhāvini*) — and I see no reason to doubt that they had direct access to Abhayagiri works. Reference to philosophical opponents as “some” or “others” would rarely if ever suggest that a writer did not know the name or school of his opponents: rather it was a matter of protocol, widely followed in Sanskrit Buddhist texts of all periods. In both the Pāli and Sanskrit tradition, it was left to the commentators to name the opponents if they so chose.

I therefore conclude that the *Vimuttimagga*, which asserts the existence of a type of intrinsic form, *sabhāva-rūpa*, called *middha*, was a manual transmitted by the Abhayagiri school within the greater Theravādin tradition.<sup>1</sup> I use the word “transmitted” advisedly: there is no evidence to date that Upatissa was a native of Ceylon or that he composed his only surviving work at the Abhayagiri Vihāra. The *Vimuttimagga* may have been composed elsewhere in Ceylon, in India, or perhaps even South-east Asia.

Who transmitted the *Vimuttimagga* in India? This is an open question. I can only note that Daśabalaśrīmitra attributes his citations to the Sthaviras — whether those of Ceylon or of India cannot be said.<sup>2</sup> According to *L'Inde classique* (§ 2147), the *Vimuttimagga* was translated from a manuscript brought to China in about 502 by another monk of Funan. Unfortunately, no source is given. If the information can be shown to be reliable, this would be important evidence for the presence of non-Mahāvihāra Theravāda in South-east Asia at an early date.

Bangkok

Peter Skilling

### Abbreviations and Bibliography

References to Pāli texts are to the editions of the Pali Text Society, with standard abbreviations, unless otherwise noted.

D Derge (sDe dge) edition of the Tibetan *Tanjur* (“Karmapa reprint”, copy courtesy Prof. H. Bechert, Göttingen)

<sup>1</sup> For references to other works considered by some to be affiliated with the Abhayagiri see Norman 1983 and 1991 and Skilling 1993A.

<sup>2</sup> For the question of the Sthavira presence in India, see Skilling 1987 and 1993B.

KBC	Lewis L. Lancaster in collaboration with Sung-bae Park, <i>The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue</i> , Berkeley, 1979
Mm	Thai script edition(s) of <i>Mahāmakuṭarājavyālaya</i> , Bangkok
Mvy	R. Sakaki (ed.), <i>Mahāvyutpatti</i> , Kyōto, 1926 [repr. Suzuki Research Foundation, Tōkyō, n. d.]
[PA]	Comments on the Chinese text by Dr. Prapod Assavavirulhakarn (see note 1 on p. 4)
Path	N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, <i>The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimagga)</i> , [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977
Q	Peking (Qianlong) edition of the Tibetan <i>Tanjur</i> (“Otani reprint”)
Sav	'Dus byas dan 'dus ma byas rnam par nes pa. D 3897, Vol. 108, dbu ma, ha; Q 5865, Vol. 146, no mtshar bstan bcos, ño.
T	Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripitaka

*Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha*: Thai script edition, *Mahāmakuṭarājavyālaya*, Bangkok, 2516 [1973]; Nārada Mahā Thera (ed., tr.), *A Manual of Abhidhamma, being Abhidhammattha Sangaha of Bhadanta Anuruddhācariya*, 5th. ed., Kuala Lumpur, 1987

Bureau, André, 1955: *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule (Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient XXXVIII)*, Paris

Bechert, Heinz, 1992: “Buddha-field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35, pp. 95–108

Hirakawa, Akira et. al., 1978: *Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Peking Edition)*, Part Three, Tibetan-Sanskrit, Tokyo

Karunadasa, Y., 1967: *Buddhist Analysis of Matter*, Colombo

Lévi, Sylvain, 1915: "Le catalogue géographique des Yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī", *Journal asiatique*, onzième série, tome V, pp. 19–138

Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu: *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga) by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*, Kandy, 1975

Norman, K.R., 1983: *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda, [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 2), Wiesbaden

Norman, K.R., 1991: "The Literary Works of the Abhayagirivihārins", in V.N. Jha (ed.), *Kalyāṇa-mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, pp. 41–50

Skilling, Peter, 1987: "The Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya of Daśabalaśrimitra", *Buddhist Studies Review*, 4/1, pp. 3–23

Skilling, Peter, 1993A: "A Citation from the \*Buddhavāmsa of the Abhayagiri School", *JPTS* XVIII, pp. 165–75

Skilling, Peter, 1993B: "Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation", *JPTS* XIX, pp. 69–201

Yamaguchi, Susumu, 1974: *Index to the Prasannapadā Madhyamaka-vṛtti*, Part Two, Tibetan-Sanskrit, Kyoto

Table 1: The 26 types of derived form<sup>1</sup>

	Samskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya	The Path of Freedom (D 179a5; Q 90b8)
*1.	<i>mig</i> <i>cakkhu</i> eye	The sense organs of 1. eye
*2.	<i>rna ba</i> <i>sota</i> ear	2. ear
*3.	<i>sna</i> <i>ghāna</i> nose	3. nose
*4.	<i>lce</i> <i>jivhā</i> tongue	4. tongue
*5.	<i>lus</i> <i>kāya</i> body	5. body
*6.	<i>gzugs</i> <i>rūpa</i> [visible] form	6. matter as sense-object
*7.	<i>sgra</i> <i>sadda</i> sound	7. sound as sense-object

<sup>1</sup> An asterisk indicates that an item is given in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* list (§ 596).

*8.	<i>dri</i> <i>gandha</i> odour	8. odour as sense-object
*9.	<i>ro</i> <i>rasa</i> taste	9. taste as sense-object
—	( <i>reg pa</i> ) ( <i>phassa</i> ) (contact)	—
*10.	<i>bud med kyi dbañ po</i> <i>itthindriya</i> femininity-faculty	10. femininity
*11.	<i>skyes pa'i dbañ po</i> <i>purisindriya</i> masculinity-faculty	11. masculinity
*12.	<i>srog gi dbañ po</i> <i>jīvitindriya</i> life-faculty	12. life-principle
*13.	<i>lus kyi rig byed</i> <i>kāyaviññatti</i> bodily expression	13. body-intimation
*14.	<i>ñag gi rig byed</i> <i>vacīviññatti</i> vocal expression	14. speech-intimation
*15.	<i>nam mkha'i khams</i> <i>ākāsadhātu</i> space element	15. element of space

*16.	<i>gzugs kyi yañ ba ñid</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>rūpassa lahutā</i> lightness of form	16. buoyancy of matter
*17.	<i>gzugs kyi 'jam pa ñid</i> <i>rūpassa mudutā</i> plasticity of form	17. impressibility of matter
*18.	<i>gzugs kyi las su ruñ ba ñid</i> <i>rūpassa kammaññatā</i> wieldiness of form	18. adaptability of matter
*19.	<i>gzugs kyi 'phel ba</i> <sup>3</sup> <i>rūpassa upacaya</i> growth of form	19. integration of matter
*20.	<i>gzugs kyi rgyud</i> <i>rūpassa santati</i> continuity of form	20. continuity of matter
21.	<i>gzugs kyi skye ba</i> <sup>4</sup> <i>rūpassa jāti</i> birth of form	21. arising of matter <sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> D *spañ* for *yañ*.

<sup>3</sup> Also at Q 91b1, 94a2. 'Phel ba, increase, development, growth, etc., is given as the equivalent of Sanskrit *upacaya* at Mvy 7437, and in Yamaguchi, p. 145. Other equivalents include *virūḍhi*, *vivardhana*, *vrddhi*, *caya*, etc. The *Visuddhimagga* (380 § 67, Mm III 18,10) gives *vadḍhi* as a synonym of *upacaya* "according to the *Atṭhakathā*". Both Nānamoli (p. 489) and Karunadasa (1967, pp. 78, etc.) translate *upacaya* as "growth".

<sup>4</sup> Also at Q 91b1, 94a2.

<sup>5</sup> "Arising of matter" is omitted here in the English translation (*Path*, 238,17) but found in the Chinese of the Taishō edition (445c22). It is given at *Path* 240,25, where it is defined as "the arising of material objects is the coming to birth of matter", as well as at 241,26 ("birth of matter"), 242,5,28 ("birth"), 245,17 ("birth of matter").

*22.	gzugs kyi rga ba <sup>6</sup> rūpassa jara[tā] decay of form	22. decay of matter
*23.	gzugs kyi mi rtag pa rūpassa anicca[tā] impermanence of form	23. impermanency of matter
*24.	kham kyi zas <sup>7</sup> kabalīñkāra-āhāra nutriment	24. solid food
25.	dños po 'i no bo <sup>8</sup> vatthurūpa form as base	25. the basis of the material element
26.	gñid <sup>9</sup> middha torpor	26. the material quality of torpor (middha-rūpa)

<sup>6</sup> Same at Q 93b1, 94a3 but *gzugs kyi rñiñs pa* at 91b2.

<sup>7</sup> Also at Q 91b1, 93b8.

<sup>8</sup> Also at Q 91a6, 93a8, 93b8. *Dños po* = *vastu*, *padārtha*, *bhāva* (Yamaguchi, pp. 41–44); Mvy 793, 949, etc.; Hirakawa et al. p. 50. *No bo* = *rūpa* (Yamaguchi, p. 41), also *bhāva* (Hirakawa et al., p. 49). Note that while both *Sav* and the *Path* place *vatthurūpa* here as § 25, the *Visuddhimagga* places the equivalent *hadayavatthu* between §§ 12 and 13.

<sup>9</sup> Also at Q 91a8 (correct *ñid* to *gñid*), 93b2, 93b8 (correct *ñid* to *gñid*).

Table 2: Classification of *vatthu-rūpa*, *middha*, and *rūpassa jāti*

A. Vatthu-rūpa	B. Middha	C. Rūpassa jāti
1) <i>las kyis kun tu bslāñ ba</i> Q 91a5, D 179b1 <i>kamma-samutthāna</i> arisen from kamma <sup>1</sup>	<i>dus dañ sems dañ zas kyis</i> <i>kyis kun tu bslāñ ba</i> Q 91a7, D 179b3 <i>utu-citta-āhāra-samutthāna</i> arisen from temperature, mind, and nutriment	<i>dus dañ las dañ sems dañ zas</i> <i>rnams kyis kun tu bslāñ ba</i> Q 91a8, D 179b3 <i>utu-kamma-citta-āhāra-samutthāna</i> arisen from time, kamma, mind, and nutriment
2) <i>phra mo</i> , Q 93a3, D 180b7 <i>sukhuma</i> subtle	idem	idem
3) <i>phyi rol</i> , Q 93a4, D 180b7 <i>bahiddhā</i> outer	idem	idem

<sup>1</sup> The *vatthu-dasaka* is also described as *las kyis kun nas bslāñ ba* (Q 91b3, D 179b1).

4)	<i>dbaī po min</i> , Q 93a6, D 181a2 <i>anindriya</i> non-faculty	idem	
5)	<i>zin pa</i> , Q 93a8, D 181a3 <i>upādīna</i> grasped	<i>ma zin pa</i> , Q 93a8, D 181a3 <i>anupādīna</i> ungrasped	<i>rnam par phye ba</i> , Q 93b2, D 181a4 <i>*vibhāta</i> to be distinguished (?)
6)	<i>bstan du med pa thogs pa med pa</i> Q 93b5, D 181a7 <i>anidassana-appatigha</i> invisible and non-obstructive	idem	
7)	<i>rañ bžin gyi gzugs</i> , Q 93b7, D 181b1 <i>sabhaiva-rūpa</i> intrinsic form	idem	

## PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES XII<sup>1</sup>

### TEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random group of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there, or misunderstood by translators.

1. (a)pi; emphatic particle
2. *abhijāna* “knowledge”
3. *assa* = *yassa*
4. *kañcana* “golden”
5. *kañcanadepiccha* “golden two-winged one”
6. *khuddā* “bee”, *khudda(ka)* “honey”
7. *je*: vocative particle
8. *dhoreyya* “foremost”
9. *bārasa* “twelve”
10. *sadhāyamānarūpa* “abusive”

1. (a)pi: emphatic particle

We find at D III 203,22 the sentence *api ssu nam mārisa amanussā rittam pi pattam sīse nikujjeyyum*, which is translated by Rhys Davids

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI”, in *JPTS* XVIII, 1993, pp. 149–64.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS(D) = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Dictionary); CP I, II, III, IV = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vols. I, II, III, IV, PTS 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; AMg = Ardha-Māgadhi; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = Gāndhāri Dharmapada; B<sup>e</sup> = Burmese edition; C<sup>e</sup> = Sinhalese edition; E<sup>e</sup> = European edition; cty/cties = commentary/ commentaries.